

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

To support an anticipation rejection, the PTO must cite a reference teaching a semiconductor optical device apparatus as claimed. However, applicants have studied the *Shimoyama et al.* disclosure and find no teaching of a semiconductor optical device apparatus that has a dielectric protection film with a stripe-shaped opening as claimed. Furthermore, although the Office Action includes a statement on page 3 explicitly representing that *Shimoyama et al.* teaches the stripe-shaped opening as recited in the claim, the Office Action fails to provide a supporting citation following the statement.

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action's general citation of Figs. 1-6, the Abstract, and pages 2-10, but this is only a citation of the entire *Shimoyama et al.* document, with the exception of the claims and Fig. 7 (which graphically represents electrical characteristics of the *Shimoyama et al.* semiconductor light-emitting device).

Because the Office Action does not support its statement that the *Shimoyama et al.* "stripe-shape opening" satisfies at least one of the two conditions specified in claim 1, the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 42-45, 48 and 51-53, the Office Action has not been justified. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is now solicited.

Claims 2-41, 46, 47, 49, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over *Shimoyama et al.* in view of *Adachi et al.* (U.S. Pat. 5,974,068). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as improper.

Although not explicitly stated in the Office Action, it is implied that the obviousness rejection relies in part on *Shimoyama et al.* anticipating base claim 1. However, as discussed above, *Shimoyama et al.* cannot properly anticipate claim 1. Therefore, an obviousness rejection based in part on such an anticipation rejection of claim 1 cannot be proper.

For this reason, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of dependent claims 2-41, 46, 47, 49, and 50 is now solicited.

In view of the remarks above, applicants now submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension, or any other fees which may be due, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,109

Atty. Docket No. **000202**  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111

JLF/

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time

Q:\2000\000202\000202 response to 11-19-03 action.doc